UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/434,268	11/05/1999	DERMOT TIMOTHY O'BRIEN	JA999-716	3752

39903	7590	02/07/2005

ANTHONY ENGLAND
PO Box 5307
AUSTIN, TX 78763-5307

EXAMINER
SINGH, RACHNA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 02/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 09/434,268
Filing Date: November 05, 1999
Appellant(s): O'BRIEN, DERMOT TIMOTHY

Anthony V.S. England
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

(1)   Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 7/29/2004.

(2)   Related Appeals and Interferences

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly

affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal

is contained in the brief.

(3)   Status of Claims

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4)   Status of Amendments After Final

The amendment after final rejection filed on 5/24/04 has been entered.

(5)   Summary of Invention

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

(6)   Issues

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims 1,8, 18, and 22 fall together and

provides reasons as set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) and (c)(8).

Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims 2-6, 9-11, and 23-27 fall

together and provides reasons as set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) and (c)(8).

(8)   Claims Appealed

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(9)   Prior Art of Record

6476828 B1   Burkett et al.   11-2002

6415193   Betawar et al.   07-2002

(10)   ***Grounds of Rejection***

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6, 8-11 and 18-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Burkett et al., US Patent 6,476,828 B1, 11/5/02 (filed 5/28/99) in view

of Betawar et al., US Patent 6,415,193 B1, 7/2/02 (filed 7/8/99).

In reference to AMENDED claim 1, Burkett teaches a system for building and

displaying dynamic graphical user interfaces comprising the following:

- Matching a selected data group with a layout to dynamically construct a

  GUI by combining a data group with a layout. See column 8. Compare to

  "representing a text file as a Graphical User Interface (GUI) . . ."

- Rendering data items from the XML file within the GUI display space. See

  columns 9-10 and figures 13A and 13B. A means where data within the

  GUI can be changed dynamically by the user. In incorporating the XML

  data items within the GUI, the system is allowing users to enter

  information in fields and sub-fields (for attributes). See column 1 and

figures 6A-6F, 13A-13B, and 15. Compare to *". . .GUI having parameter*

fields, and for each parameter field, having one or more attribute

sub-fields, each of said sub-fields being text editable;".

- Storing changes made to the XML file via the GUI. See column 4.

  Compare to *"storing attribute text entered in any sub-field to a data*

  store".

Applicant's amendment to the claim recites "representing said text file as a GUI

having a navigator panel and an edit panel, wherein the navigator panel shows, for the

text file, a structure for the parameters;" Examiner maintains that Burkett does teach

"representing said text file as a GUI" as recited in the Applicant's claim. In building the

Graphical User Interface, Burkett also discloses that the layout is displayed to the user

and responds dynamically to user requests. See column 1, lines 20-64. Furthermore,

Burkett's system does show the structure for the parameters within the GUI. See figure

13B and column 9, lines 35-50 in which the display layout of the data group is

discussed. Specifically, Burkett teaches that data items are ordered within the group

including data entry fields and are defined by the display layout in figure 13B.

Applicant's amendment to claim 1 further adds the limitation, "showing in the edit

panel, responsive to a user selecting one of the parameters in the navigator panel: the

one of the parameters in a parameter field, and one or more attribute sub-fields for the

selected one of the parameters". Burkett teaches rendering data items from a XML file

in the GUI display space. The user can change the data dynamically. See column 1

and figures 6A-6F, 13A-13B, and 15. Furthermore, see column 9, lines 35-50 where

Burkett teaches that contents can be altered. In figure 6D, the data items are displayed

within a graphical tree and each node may be addressable and selectable by the user

for editing. Burkett teaches both a panel for showing the structure for the parameters as

well as a means for altering or editing the contents.

Burkett teaches a dynamic graphical user interface derived from an XML data

group. He does not specifically state creating a text file of parameter meta data even

though the XML data group implies a file of data; however, Betawar teaches a system

for editing parameter-level information in a semiconductor-manufacturing environment.

In Betawar's system, a R-DOM (recipe distributed object model) is generated for a

recipe-file format that is later presented in a editor in which a user may edit various

parameters. Betawar's system illustrates the idea of creating a text file of parameter

meta data in his use of a DOM. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of the invention to combine Betawar's text file creation with Burkett's

dynamic GUI since both are concerned with parameter modification in a template/editor

or GUI and representing parameters directly from the text file allow the sequence of

parameter to be more efficiently mapped to the display and editing of the GUI. See

abstract of both Betawar and Burkett. Moreover, Burkett teaches the use of a "data

group" which could be interpreted as a "text file".

In reference to claim 2, Burkett teaches generating a GUI based on an XML data

group. He does not specifically state "text file"; however, Betawar teaches creating a

text file from a DOM to convert the recipes. It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Betawar's creation of the

text file with Burkett's use of XML since an XML parser reads XML files to generate a

DOM tree. See column 4 of Burkett.

In reference to claim 3, Burkett does not teach using a URI; however, Betawar

teaches using a system where the text file is in a database format. Since a URI is used

to specify addresses and names of objects, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize a URI in storing the text

entered by the user since Betawar already teaches storing the text file in a database.

See column 15, lines 30-40.

In reference to claim 4, Burkett's system teaches incorporating the data group

into the GUI. See rejections for claim 1 above.

In reference to claim 5, Burkett teaches the use of Java code for carrying out the

operations. See column 4, lines 54-65.

In reference to claim 6, Burkett does not teach calling a subset of a text file

corresponding to a parameter; however, Betawar teaches calling a subset of a file

based on user security or parameter-level security levels. Thus he teaches calling a

subset based on the access-level. See abstract. It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to call only a subset as taught by

Betawar in the system of Burkett since both are of analogous art in dealing with editing

parameters in a GUI/editor.

Claim 8 is rejected under the same rationale used in claim 1 above and further in

view of the following comments. Burkett teaches that the invention may be embodied

as a data processing system in the form of an entirely hardware embodiment or

software embodiment or combination of the two. Thus utilizing a client/server system

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

since Burkett suggest the use of various embodiments.

Claims 9-11 are rejected under the same rationale used above in reference to

claims 2-5 respectively.

Claim 18 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1 above.

Claims 19-21 are rejected under the same rationale used above in reference to

claims 2-5 respectively.

Claims 22-28 are rejected under the same rationale used above in claims 1-6 and 4

respectively.

(11) Response to Argument

Appellant argues with regards to claims 1, 8, 18, and 22 that Burkett is

concerned with *building* a graphical user interface in contrast with the present invention

which is concerned with *using* a graphical user interface for parameter maintenance

application in order to graphically represent information that describes parameters and

to enable the user to select a parameter and modify an existing attribute or populate a

vacant attribute of the selected parameter as a screen-based edit function. Appellant's

independent claims in the present invention recite "representing said text file as a GUI

having a navigator panel and an edit panel, wherein the navigator panel shows, for the

text file, a structure for the parameters;" Examiner maintains that Burkett does teach

"representing said text file as a GUI" as recited in the Appellant's claim. In building the

Graphical User Interface, Burkett also discloses that the layout is displayed to the user

and responds dynamically to user requests. See column 1, lines 20-64. Furthermore,

Burkett's system does show the structure for the parameters within the GUI. See figure

13B and column 9, lines 35-50 in which the display layout of the data group is

discussed. Specifically, Burkett teaches that data items are ordered within the group

including data entry fields and are defined by the display layout in figure 13B.

Appellant's claim recites "representing said text file as a Graphical User Interface having

a navigator panel and an edit panel". Examiner does not interpret "representing to

mean "using". The term "represent" means to portray, not to use. Furthermore, even if

it is assumed that the Appellant's claim recites or intends to recites the limitation "using

a GUI to change data that was used to build the GUI in the first place", Burkett teaches

such features. Burkett teaches rendering data items from a XML file in the GUI display

space. The data can be changed dynamically by the user. See column 1 and figures

6A-6F, 13A-13B, and 15. Furthermore, see column 9, lines 35-50 where Burkett

teaches that contents can be altered. In figure 6D, the data items are displayed within a

graphical tree and each node may be addressable and selectable by the user for

editing. Burkett teaches both a panel for showing the structure for the parameters as

well as a means for altering or editing the contents.

Appellant's amendment to claims 1, 8, 18, and 22 further add the limitation,

"showing in the edit panel, responsive to a user selecting one of the parameters in the

navigator panel: the one of the parameters in a parameter field, and one or more

attribute sub-fields for the selected one of the parameters". As stated in the previous

office action, Burkett teaches rendering data items from a XML file in the GUI display

space. The data can be changed dynamically by the user. See column 1 and figures

6A-6F, 13A-13B, and 15. Furthermore, see column 9, lines 35-50 where Burkett

teaches that contents can be altered. In figure 6D, the data items are displayed within a

graphical tree and each node may be addressable and selectable by the user for

editing. Burkett teaches both a panel for showing the structure for the parameters as

well as a means for altering or editing the contents. Appellant further argues that the

present invention provides the advantage of editing and reloading an XML file while an

application is still running, and the maintenance GUI dynamically re-generated to

accommodate modifications allow new parameter values to be entered. As stated

above, Burkett does teach accommodating modifications to allow new parameters to be

edited and entered. See column 1 and figures 6A-6F, 13A-13B, and 15. Furthermore,

see column 9, lines 35-50 where Burkett teaches that contents can be altered. In figure

6D, the data items are displayed within a graphical tree and each node may be

addressable and selectable by the user for editing. Burkett teaches both a panel for

showing the structure for the parameters as well as a means for altering or editing the

contents.

Appellant argues that Examiner has evaded the issue of the GUI having an edit

panel structure. Examiner directs Appellant to column 1, figures 6A-6F, 13A-13B, and

15, and column 9, lines 35-50. In figure 6D, the data items are displayed within a

graphical tree and each node may be addressable and selectable by the user for

editing. Burkett teaches both a panel for showing the structure for the parameters as

well as a means for altering or editing the contents. Appellant argues that the passage

concerning changing data in Burkett does not state how the data is changed and does

not maintain parameter information by representing information as a GUI and using the

GUI to modify information. Examiner respectfully disagrees. maintenance GUI

dynamically re-generated to accommodate modifications allow new parameter values to

be entered. As stated above, Burkett does teach accommodating modifications to allow

new parameters to be edited and entered. See column 1 and figures 6A-6F, 13A-13B,

and 15. Furthermore, see column 9, lines 35-50 where Burkett teaches that contents

can be altered. In figure 6D, the data items are displayed within a graphical tree and

each node may be addressable and selectable by the user for editing. Burkett teaches

both a panel for showing the structure for the parameters as well as a means for altering

or editing the contents.

In view of comments and rejections above, Examiner has maintained rejections.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Rachna Singh
January 26, 2005

Conferees

Joseph Feild

Stephen Hong

INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION
ALMADEN RESEARCH CENTER
650 HARRY ROAD
SAN JOSE,, CA 95120